

## REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 3-41, 43, 44 and 47-52 are pending. In the office action, all pending claims are rejected.

Applicant has canceled claims 7-9, 12-14, 18, 36-39, 47, 48, 51 and 52, amended claims 3, 6, 10, 15-17, 26, 35, 43, 44 and 49 and added new claims 53-58.

Claims 3, 16, 26, 35 and 43 have been amended such that if the frame characteristic is the second characteristic, one of said at least one video frame is decoded and changed to achieve the video effect. Claim 49 has been amended such that the apparatus comprises means for decoding one of said at least one video frame for providing a decoded video frame, if the frame characteristic is the second characteristic, and means for modifying the decoded video frame for achieving the video effect.

The support of the amendment can be found on Figure 8.

Claim 10 has been amended to delete the word "video".

Claim 15 has been amended such that the modifying and changing is based on a user's chosen editing reference.

The term "changing" is used interchangeably with "modifying" in claim 11.

Claim 17 has been amended to change the wording of the claim.

Claim 44 has been amended to change the wording of the claim.

New claim 53 is dependent from claim 3 and includes the further limitation that the video effect is a scene-transition effect, decoding at least one of said preceding video frames if the frame characteristic is the second characteristic, and transforming the decoded video frame into an intra frame after said changing.

The support can be found on p.12, lines 2-20 and Figure 8.

New claim 54 is dependent from claim 3 and includes the further limitation that the video effect is a color-change effect.

The support can be found on page 11, lines 5-9.

New claim 55 is dependent from claim 17 and includes the further limitations that the spatial domain processing module comprises a special effect processor and a transition effect processor, and the video effect comprises a color-change effect and a scene-transition effect, and that

if the video effect is a scene-transition effect, said transition effect processor is adapted for changing the decoded video frame and the decoding module is further adapted for decoding said at least one of said preceding video frames so as to transform the decoded video frame into an intra frame after said changing for achieving the scene-transition effect; and

if the video effect is a color-change effect, said special effect processor is adapted for changing the decoded video frame for achieving the color-change effect.

The support can be found on Figures 6 and 8; and page 12, lines 2-13.

New claim 56 is dependent from claim 26 and includes the further limitations that the media editing device further a special effect processor and a transition effect processor, and the video effect comprises a color-change effect and a scene-transition effect, and that

if the video effect is a scene-transition effect, said transition effect processor is adapted for changing the decoded video frame and the further module is further adapted for decoding said at least one of said preceding video frames so as to transform the decoded video frame into an intra frame after said changing for achieving the scene-transition effect; and

if the video effect is a color-change effect, said special effect processor is adapted for changing the decoded video frame for achieving the color-change effect.

The support can be found on Figures 6 and 8; and page 12, lines 2-13.

New claim 57 is dependent from claim 35 and includes the further limitations that the video editing device further a special effect processor and a transition effect processor, and the editing effect comprises a color-change effect and a scene-transition effect, and that

if the editing effect is a scene-transition effect, said transition effect processor is adapted for changing the decoded video frame and the further module is further adapted for decoding said at least one of said preceding video frames so as to transform the decoded video frame into an intra frame after said changing for achieving the scene-transition effect; and

if the editing effect is a color-change effect, said special effect processor is adapted for changing the decoded video frame for achieving the color-change effect.

The support can be found on Figures 6 and 8; and page 12, lines 2-13.

New claim 58 is dependent from claim 43, and includes the further limitations that the video effect comprises a color-change effect and a scene-transition effect, and that the software program further comprises:

a code for changing the decoded video frame, decoding said at least one of said preceding video frame, transforming the decoding video frame into an intra frame after said changing for achieving the scene-transition effect, if the editing effect is the scene-transition effect, and

a coding for changing the decoded video frame for achieving the color-change effect if the editing effect is the color-change effect.

The support can be found on Figure 8; and page 12, lines 2-13.

No new matter has been introduced.

On page 4 of the office action, claims 3, 16-22, 26-32 and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Wee et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,441, hereafter referred to as *Wee*).

Applicant has canceled claims 18, 51 and 52.

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner states that *Wee* discloses that

if the frame characteristic of that at least one video frame is the first characteristic (I frame), the bitstream is modified in the compressed domain based on specified editing parameters, but

if the frame characteristic of that at least one video frame is a second characteristic (P or B frame), then one or more preceding frames are decoded along with that at least one video frame, and the last of the decoded frames is encoded before the bitstream is modified (col. 11, lines 9-32).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is respectfully submitted that, claims 3, 16 and 26 have been amended such that if the frame characteristic of said at least one video frame is the second characteristic, decoding one of said at least one video frame for providing a decoded video frame and changing said decoded video frame for achieving the video effect.

As shown in Figure 4, *Wee* discloses that when a cut sequence is used to form the tail data stream (block 205). If the first frame in a cut sequence to be appended to another image sequence is a P frame (such as the sequence P<sub>6</sub>B<sub>7</sub>B<sub>8</sub> P<sub>9</sub>I<sub>0</sub>... that is cut from an original sequence ...B<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub>I<sub>3</sub>P<sub>4</sub>B<sub>5</sub>P<sub>6</sub>B<sub>7</sub>B<sub>8</sub> P<sub>9</sub>I<sub>0</sub>... ), then it is required to decompress as little as four entire frames and perform three re-conversions to achieve the desired splicing. For example, prior to any cut, the frames P<sub>6</sub>B<sub>7</sub>B<sub>8</sub> ... could be decoded to the image domain, and then recoded as I<sub>6</sub>P<sub>7</sub>B<sub>8</sub> ... frames (col.11, lines 19-26). Thus, in *Wee*, more than one frame in the sequence to be appended is decoded, modified and recoded.

In contrast, according to the claimed invention, only one frame is decoded into a decoded video frame and the decoded video frame is changed for achieving the video effect.

For the above reasons, *Wee* fails to anticipate claims 3, 16 and 26.

As for claims 15-17, 19-22 and 27-32, they are dependent from claims 3, 16 and 26. For reasons regarding claims 3, 16 and 26 above, *Wee* also fails to anticipate claims 15-17, 19-22 and 27-32.

On page 9, claims 4-11, 15, 35-41, 43-44 and 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wee*, in view of *Naimpally et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,477,397, hereafter referred to as *Naimpally*). In rejecting those claims, the Examiner admitted that *Wee* fails to disclose converting the VLC coded video into a binary form prior to said modification, but pointed to *Naimpally* for disclosing converting VLC coded data into a binary form.

Applicant has canceled claims 7-9, 36-39 and 47-48.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 35 and 43 include the limitation that if the frame characteristic of said at least one video frame is the second characteristic, decoding one of said at least one video frame for providing a decoded video frame and changing said decoded video frame for achieving the video effect.

As pointed out regarding claim 1 above, *Wee* fails to disclose this limitation.

For the above reasons, *Wee*, in view of *Naimpally*, fail to render claims 35 and 43 obvious.

Claim 49 has the limitations of having means for decoding one of said at least one video frame is decoded for providing a decoded video frame, if the frame characteristic is the second characteristic, and means for modifying the decoded video frame for achieving the video effect.

As pointed out regarding claim 1 above, *Wee* fails to disclose the limitation of decoding one of the video frame for providing a decoded video frame, modifying the decoded video frame to achieve the video effect.

For the above reasons, *Wee*, in view of *Naimpally*, fail to render claim 49 obvious.

Claims 4-6, 10, 11, 15, 40-41, 44, and 50 are dependent from claims 3, 35, 43 and 49. For reasons regarding claims 3, 35, 43 and 49 above, claims 4-6, 10, 11, 15, 40-41, 44, and 50 are also distinguishable over the cited *Wee* and *Naimpally* references.

On page 14, claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wee*, in view of *Naimpally*, and further in view of *Abe* (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,491). The Examiner cites *Abe* for disclosing combining the audio data with edited video data.

Applicant has canceled claims 12-14.

On page 15, claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wee*, in view of *Abe*.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 23-25 are dependent from claim 16 and recite features not recited in claim 16. For reasons regarding claim 16 above, claims 23-25 are also distinguishable over the cited *Wee* and *Abe* references.

On page 16, claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wee*, in view of *Ikonen* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No, 2003/0005329).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 33 and 34 are dependent from claim 26 and recite features not recited in claim 26. For reasons regarding claim 26 above, claims 33 and 34 are also distinguishable over the cited *Wee* and *Ikonen* references.

CONCLUSION

Claims 3-6, 10, 11, 15-17, 19-35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 49, 50 and 53-58 are allowable. Early allowance of claims 3-6, 10, 11, 15-17, 19-35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 49, 50 and 53-58 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ken Lao".

Kenneth Q. Lao  
Registration No. 40,061

Date: February 12, 2009

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building 5  
755 Main Street, PO Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234